



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,497	02/06/2004	David K. McKnight	CA919990017US2	6632
58139	7590	06/18/2007		
IBM CORP. (WSM) c/o WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C. P.O. BOX 50784 DALLAS, TX 75201			EXAMINER PATEL, MANGLES M	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/18/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/773,497	Applicant(s) MCKNIGHT ET AL.	
	Examiner Manglesh M. Patel	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14,15,37-39 and 44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14,15,37-39 and 44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Non-Final action is responsive to the amendment filed on 9/28/2006.
2. Claims 1-13, 16-36 and 40-43 are canceled from the previous restriction requirement in application 09/489793, Claims 14-15, 37-39 and 44 are pending. Claims 14 & 37 are independent claims.

Withdrawn Rejections

3. The 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections of claims 37 & 38 have been withdrawn in light of the amendment.
4. The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of claims 14-15, 37-39 and 44 with cited reference of Yasin U.S. Pub 2004/0205549 have been withdrawn in light of the persuasive arguments and newly cited art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
6. Claims 14 & 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims use the words "can be" such language renders the claims indefinite and should be avoided in claim language. Appropriate corrections are required.
7. Regarding Dependent claims 15, 38-39 and 44 are rejected because they inherit the deficiencies of Independent claims 14 and 37.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this

Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 14-15, 37-39 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lie et al. (Cascading Style Sheets, Level 1, W3C, Jan 1999, pgs 1-70).

Regarding Independent claim 14 and 37, A method for generating an output document in a user preferred style, comprising the steps of: reading an example file representing said user preferred style into an input buffer; searching said input buffer for a pattern that matches that of an expected section; if said pattern is found, from the position of said pattern, defining a first bound by searching backwards in said buffer until a previous expected search pattern is found; from the position of said pattern, defining a second bound by searching forwards in said buffer until a next expected search pattern is found; copying a string of characters contained within said input buffer between said first bound and said second bound to a template buffer; parsing said template buffer to isolate expected keywords, and names and subsections; if said expected section is a section that can be repeated in a document, saving in said template buffer the line offsets of keywords, names and other elements; replacing content-specific subsections with macro names; and if said pattern is not found, creating a default template buffer for said expected section.

Lie teaches the application of a Cascading Style Sheet for formatting output documents such as HTML web pages in a style preferred by a user (pg 6, section 1). He teaches that the application of a CSS allows the generation of an output document in a user preferred style. He first teaches an example file which is the CSS defined by a user and includes all the user preferred style which is read into an input buffer or memory via parsing operation done by the browser.

Furthermore he states that the web browser must be aware of the existence of the style sheet (pg 6, sections 1 & 1.1).

He then shows that an external style sheet being references several ways, one which includes using a LINK element with an Href attribute to access the example file. Once the external style sheet/example file is referenced the code portion or expected section defined in section 1.1 on page 6 denoted by <H1> is compared with the definition or selector defined in the example file such as H1 {color: blue } described on pg 6, section 1, this being done during the parsing operation by the browser which is searching an input buffer or memory. Once the selector or pattern which is the match between the selector of the external style sheet/example file and the expected section in the output document is found, a first bound and second bound are searched. These bounds are denoted by the { } parenthesis used to define the style definition associated with the selector and disclosed in section 1 on page 6. Furthermore if the expected section such has H1 in the output document is repeated the referenced external stylesheet is stored in memory to access the keywords, names and other elements defined in the example file such has the style definition associated with the selector h1. Furthermore if the pattern is not found than a default template is used. This default template is describe by Lie in section 1 page 6, he states "HTML authors need to write style sheets only if they want to suggest a specific style

for their documents. Each User Agent (UA, often a web browser or web client) will have a default style sheet that presents documents in a reasonable—but arguably mundane manner.” Furthermore Lie states in pg 15 section 3 “By default, the weights of the reader's rules are less than the weights of rules in the author's documents. I.e., if there are conflicts between the style sheets of an incoming document and the reader's personal sheets, the author's rules will be used. Both reader and author rules override the UA's default values.” Here lie suggests the use of a default template for an expected section with no user defined style being referenced, which is accomplished by the browser. Lie simply describes parsing done by the browser to be able to apply an external CSS to a web document, he fails to explicitly describe the process of backwards and forward searching of patterns in the buffer. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to associate backward and forward searching of patterns in an input buffer. Such searching is merely a parsing operation used to determine selector definitions to associate with the HTML document prior to the application of the style sheet and generation of the desired output document. The motivation for doing so would have been to apply a CSS to an HTML document by searching the external stylesheet selectors, hence resulting in an output document in a user preferred style.

Regarding Dependent claims 15, 38 and 44, Getting a said template buffer for each section to be generated in said output document; getting user content for all sections of said output document; creating an output buffer for storing said output document; for each section of said output document, putting a corresponding template buffer into a temporary output buffer; replacing macro names in said temporary output buffer with user content information: if this section is expected to be repeated and the user desires alignment, using corresponding template offsets to modify said temporary output buffer for aligning keywords, names, and other sub-sections; inserting the content of said temporary output buffer into said output buffer; and writing said output buffer to a file.

Lie teaches accessing selectors (sections) defined in an external style sheet which include content for sections of an output document (see pg 6, sections 1 and 1.1). The process of applying an External stylesheet to an HTML document includes replacing macro names or ID selectors as defined in section 1.5 on page 9, with content information which is simply the defined user style in the example file. Furthermore if the expected section such as H1 in the output document is repeated the referenced external stylesheet is stored in memory to access the keywords, names and other elements defined in the example file such as the style definition associated with the selector h1.

Dependent claim 39, the claims describe a program storage device that performs the method steps of claim 14 and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

*It is noted that any citation **[[s]]** to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. **[[See, MPEP 2123]]***

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 9/28/2006 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejections and newly cited art.

Conclusion

Reference Cited

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- DeRose et al. (U.S. 5,644,776) discloses "Data Processing System And Method For Random Access Formatting Of A Portion Of a Large Hierarchical Electronically Published Document With Descriptive Markup"
 - Hill et al. (U.S. 6,023,714) discloses "Method And System For Dynamically Adapting The Layout Of A Document To An Output Device"


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W 6 am-3 pm T, TH 6 am-2pm, Fr 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel
Patent Examiner
June 9, 2007



CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER